

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/388,069	09/01/1999	STEPHEN LEROY POLLARD		3357	
7590 11/01/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
	EROY POLLARD		DANG, HU	DANG, HUNG XUAN	
27703 -14 Ortega Hwy SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CA 92675			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2873	2873	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advison, Action	09/388,069	POLLARD, STEPHEN LEROY			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hung X. Dang	2873			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 7/15/05 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
 a)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>7-9</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					
the glant					
		Hung X Dang Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2873			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

09/388,069 Application No. 09/004,007

Continuation of 2.

NOTE: Applicant argued that "Neither Chang et al or Leonardi disclose or suggest as per claim 7 side bands in conjunction with the expansion loop over the top of the head to allow the wearer to easily manually adjust."

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., side bands in conjunction with the expansion loop over the top of the head to allow the wearer to easily manually adjust) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).